

REMARKS*Amendments to the Specification*

Amendments to the specification correspond to the editorial changes suggested in paragraph 6 of the Office Action. The only exceptions occur with respect to the following:

1. paragraph [0019], where Applicants maintain that the choice of the word “limits” is more appropriate than the use of the word “limit”;
2. paragraph [0020], where Applicants delete the word “a” to cure the grammatical error, and replace the phrase “with either other” with the phrase “having any combination of the above mentioned gases” to clarify the meaning of the sentence; and
3. paragraph [0025], where Applicants replace the phrase “as are required in the” with the phrase “relative to” to clarify the meaning of the sentence.

Amendments to the Claims

Claim 1 is amended such that the step of venting requires venting to “decrease the pressure within said vessel . . . such that much of said purging gas . . . is evacuated from said vessel.” Support for the amendment is presented in the specification at paragraph [0018] (noting that difference between the elevated pressure and the pressure upon venting should be “sufficiently high . . . so that most of the contents of the vessel will be evacuated . . .”).

Claims 3-6 are amended to replace the phrase “pressure differential” with the phrase “a ratio of said elevated pressure to said lesser gas pressure” to clarify the meaning of the claims. Support for these amendments is presented in the specification at paragraph [0018] (noting the difference between the elevated pressure and venting pressure may be such that the elevated pressure is various multiples (“times”) of the venting pressure).

Claims 15-17 are amended to correct the verbal tense utilized in the claims.

Claims 21 and 22 are amended to delete the phrase “its content of” and insert the phrase “from the substrate” to clarify the meaning of the claim.

Finally, Claims 1, 7-9, and 23 are amended as to form by removing the use of a period when referencing particular steps of Claim 1


In light of the aforementioned amendments, the rejections of Claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. §101, and Claims 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, are rendered moot.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 
Charlton Shen
Registration No. 54,442
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 17 September 2004